

The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 10
No. 6



OUR DUTY TO THE STATE
—
THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR
WOMAN'S SERVICE
—
WE MUST WIN BOTH WARS
—
THE CONGRESSWOMAN. ACT I
—
WHY WOMEN DO NOT WISH THE
SUFFRAGE
BY REV. LYMAN ABBOTT, D.D.
—
DISCRIMINATING AGAINST
MOTHER
—
THE CONTRAST OF A CHART WITH
THE TRUTH
—
WOMAN AS SUPREME ARCHITECT
—
RIOT AND MURDER AT CHICAGO
ELECTION

APRIL
1917



Subscription, \$1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1912, at the Post Office at New York N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, Boston, Mass.;
Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne Mac-
Irvine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. Henry B. Thompson,
Greenville, Del.; Mrs. N. C. Young, Fargo, N. Dak.;
Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.; Mrs. John F.
A. Merrill, Portland, Me.
Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.
General Secretary, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. John Balch, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. C. H. Davis, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbot, Dayton, O.
Mrs. E. Yarde Breese, Plainfield, N. J.
Mrs. Francis D. Williams, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. C. E. Estabrook, Milwaukee, Wis.
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs. David Conant, Bradford, Vt.
Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon, Ga.
Mrs. J. B. Gillilan, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mrs. Robert Garrett, Baltimore, Md.
Miss N. V. Baker, Selma, Ala.
Mrs. Ernest Jackson, Dallas, S. Dak.
Mrs. James B. Wells, Brownsville, Texas.
Mrs. D. C. Callahan, Charleston, W. Va.
Mrs. F. A. Millard, Burlington, Iowa.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

ALABAMA

President, Miss N. V. Baker, Selma.
First Vice-President, Lida B. Robertson, Mobile.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Will Roberts,
Selma.

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Lynde Harrison, New
Haven.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles H. Lawrence.
Secretary, Miss Carolyn Taylor.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William T. Howe.
Press Chairman, Mrs. William B. Williams.

DELAWARE

President, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Murray Stewart.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell,
Wilmington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Room 320, Oxford Building, 726 14th Street,
Washington.
President, Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Charles H. Davis.
Treasurer, Miss Ayla Card.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Cornelius Morse.
Recording Secretary, Miss Annie Squire.
Chairman, Executive Committee, Mrs. Arthur Wal-
lace Dunn.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Walter D. Lamar.
Secretary, Mrs. B. F. Sutton.
State Organizer, Mrs. S. C. Moore.
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. R. J. Tay-
lor.
Honorary Vice-President, Miss Mildred Ruther-
ford.
Chairman Finance Committee, Mrs. Charles Hil-
bun, Macon.

IOWA

Office: 1032 North Fourth Street, Burlington.
President, Mrs. F. A. Millard, Burlington.
First Vice-President, Miss Alice French, Daven-
port.
Secretary, Miss Mary Chittenden, Burlington.
Treasurer, Mrs. F. I. Herriott, Des Moines.

MAINE

Honorary President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.
President, Mrs. John F. A. Merrill, 94 Neal Street,
Portland.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George E. Bird.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.
Secretary, Miss Alice Wood, 206 State Street,
Portland.
Assistant Secretary, Mrs. Wm. H. Bradford.

MARYLAND

President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Michael B. Wild.
Treasurer, Mrs. Rosalie Straus.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. W. P. E.
Wyse, Pikesville.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. P. Lea Thom.
Executive Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot, 103
Read Street, Baltimore.

MASSACHUSETTS

687 Boylston Street, Boston.
President, Mrs. John Balch.
Chairman Executive Committee, Mrs. Louis A.
Frothingham.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, Walnut Street,
Brookline, Mass.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Randolph Frothingham.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster, Detroit.
First Vice-President, Mrs. L. E. Clark.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Recording Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753
Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.

MINNESOTA

Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight,
St. Paul.
President, Mrs. J. B. Gillilan, Minneapolis.
First Vice-President, Mrs. William Davis.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minne-
apolis.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. F. Stevens, St. Paul.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Ruth M. Currie,
302 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis.

NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha.
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South
35th Street.
Treasurer, Mrs. C. C. George, 5218 Chicago
Street.
Executive Committee, Mrs. L. F. Crofoot, Chair-
man.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
First Vice-President, Mrs. O. D. Felton, Concord.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond,
Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Merrill, 8
South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carrie R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.
Honorary President, Miss Anna L. Dayton.
President, Mrs. E. Yarde Breese.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. G. Herbert Smith, Sum-
mit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Ellsworth A. Cor-
bett, Trenton.
General Secretary, Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, Trenton.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles R. Smith, Ellison Street,
Paterson.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 280 Madison Ave., New York.
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs.
Francis M. Scott.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, Mrs.
Fritz Achelis, Mrs. Eleanor G. Hewitt.
Secretary, Miss Elizabeth F. Callaudet.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young, Fargo.
First Vice-President, Mrs. N. C. Frick.
Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W.
J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.

OHIO

Office: 1744 E. McMillan Street, Cincinnati.
President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbot, Dayton.
First Vice-President, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman.
Secretary, Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Cincinnati.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth
Drive, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 1108 Finance Building, 1426 South Penn
Square, Philadelphia.

President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
First Vice-President, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss
Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
First Vice-President, Miss Louise C. Hoppin.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eliza H. Howard.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

SOUTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. Ernest Jackson, Dallas.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George B. Mansfield,
Rapid City.
Secretary, Mrs. Elias Jacobsen, Pierre.
Treasurer, Mrs. S. S. Ruble.
Chairman Literature Committee, Mrs. E. B.
Northrup.

TEXAS

President, Mrs. James B. Wells, Brownsville.
Vice-President, Mrs. George F. Arnold, 709 Mc-
Kinney Avenue, Houston.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. David Conant, Bradford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Edward Kirkland.
Secretary, Miss S. Blanche Stranahan, Bradford.
Treasurer, Miss Hattie Brock, South Newbury.

VIRGINIA

Post-office Box 368, Richmond.
Honorary President, Miss Jane Rutherford.
President, Mrs. Francis D. Williams.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Otho G. Keen.
Treasurer, Mrs. Lewis Straus.
Recording Secretary, Miss Maury Robinson.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell.

WEST VIRGINIA

1102 Kanawha Street, Charleston.
Honorary Presidents, Mrs. A. B. Fleming, Fair-
mont; Mrs. Stephen B. Elkins.
President, Mrs. D. C. Callahan, Charleston.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Howard Simpson,
Wheeling.
Treasurer, Miss Jean Brown, Charleston.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Mayo Tollman,
Charleston.
Enrollment Secretary, Mrs. Joseph Gaines, Charle-
ston.

WISCONSIN

President, Mrs. C. E. Estabrook.
First Vice-President, Miss Mary Atwood.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. F. W. Hoyt, Madison.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude Bean, 4 Prospect Ave.,
Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.

OUR DUTY TO THE STATE

By MISS ALICE HILL CHITTENDEN

President, New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

IN view of the many queries as to whether this Association would continue its active campaign against woman suffrage in case of declaration of war, the Executive Committee at its meeting on March 28th authorized the following statement to be sent to all our members:

It is a truism that the American man does not wish to deny a woman anything he thinks she wants, and unless he is convinced that the women who oppose woman suffrage represent and speak for the majority of their sex, he will be apt to yield to the importunities of the suffragists and vote for woman suffrage even against his convictions.

Woman suffrage was defeated in this State, in November, 1915, by a majority of 194,984, but last year the legislators at Albany yielded to the pressure of the suffragists and voted to resubmit the amendment again in 1917. The present legislature has taken the same action; therefore, another active campaign in this State is ahead of us.

War or no war, the voters in this State must vote on this question on November 6, 1917.

The suffragists will not give up their work. We CANNOT give up ours.

There are no more patriotic women in the country today than the anti-suffragists. We recognize the tremendous crisis our

nation is facing at the present moment. Every individual anti-suffragist through the State is doing her "bit" in Red Cross or other relief work at the present time and stands ready to do more. As an Association we have recently reaffirmed our position taken a year ago on Preparedness, and have offered our service to the President of the United States, to the Governor of the State, the Mayor of the City, to the Red Cross, to the National League for Woman's Service. Some of us would like to be released from other duties to give our whole time to the service of our country along the lines of relief work, but we cannot afford to ignore the facts as they confront us in relation to woman suffrage in our own State.

The opposition to woman suffrage is not based upon sentimental reasons, but upon fundamental principles, governmental as well as biological, which lead to the conclusion that in the last analysis woman suffrage would be not merely a detriment or hindrance to woman in the line of her best development, but also a menace to the State.

Believing this, and recognizing that this menace would last after the war is a thing of the past, then surely it is our duty to do all that lies in our power to keep woman suffrage from being fastened on the great Empire State. To give up our campaign at this time would be a shirking of responsibility and an act of disloyalty to our State.

THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR WOMAN'S SERVICE

"FOR GOD—FOR COUNTRY—FOR HOME"

National Headquarters: 105 West 40th Street, New York City

SINCE the official emergency program of the National League for Woman's Service was first printed in *THE WOMAN'S PROTEST* for February, the League has met with country-wide response, and is now organized in thirty-five States. The greatest enrollments have been in the motor-driving, wireless, agricultural, canteen and social welfare departments.

The National League for Woman's Service has also organized a Bureau of Registration and Information, working in co-operation with the United States Bureau of Labor, which is equipped to lend definite and practical assistance to the plans for mobilizing labor by:

1. Securing and maintaining a live register of women trained in industrial, commercial, agricultural and professional occupations, available for instant service.
2. Assisting in the distribution of woman labor and in providing for the housing, care and protection of women called in large numbers for temporary service away from their home environment.
3. Keeping a registration of women's organizations throughout the country in the Washington Headquarters, with necessary data of organized resources for service in connection with industrial preparedness.

The Bureau of Registration and Information's address is, Room 710, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

Any readers of *THE WOMAN'S PROTEST* who have not yet enrolled with the National League for Woman's Service can now do so through their State chairmen, as follows:

ALABAMA, Mrs. Thomas Owen, Montgomery. **Arkansas**, Mrs. Jessamine Fishback, Fort Smith. **Colorado**, Mrs. J. B. Grant, 770 Pennsylvania Ave., Denver. **Connecticut**, Mrs. W. E. D. Scott, 36 Washington St., Greenwich. **Florida**, Mrs. Bion Barnett, Jacksonville. **Georgia**, Mrs. W. L. Peel, 1339 Peachtree St., Atlanta. **Illinois**, Mrs. George S. Isham, 1340 N. State St., Chicago. **Iowa**, Mrs. F. J. Mansfield, 1713 S. Main St., Burlington. **Kentucky**, Miss Mary Johnston, 329 W. Broadway, Louisville. **Louisiana**, Mrs. Roydan Douglas, 7825 Elm St., New Orleans. **Maine**, Madame de Gorgaza, 7 North St., Bath. **Maryland**, Mrs. Benjamin Cochran, Jr., 200 Goodwood Gardens, Roland Park, Baltimore. **Massachusetts**, Mrs. Barrett Wendell, 409 Marlborough St., Boston. **Michigan**, Miss Helen Keep, 753 Jefferson Ave., Detroit. **Minnesota**, Mrs. C. A. Severance, St. Paul Park, St. Paul. **Mississippi**, Mrs. Daisy M. Stevens, Jackson. **Missouri** (Eastern), Mrs. F. V. Hammar, 7 Hortense Place, St. Louis. **Missouri** (Western), Mrs. J. F. Bennie, 619 E. 64th, Kansas City. **Nebraska**, Mrs. W. G. L. Taylor, 435 North 25th St., Lincoln. **Nevada**, Mrs. O. H. Mack, 428 Hill St., Reno. **New Hampshire**, Mrs. William Schofield, Peterborough. **New Jersey**, Mrs. Ira Kipp, 589 Main St., East Orange. **New Mexico**, Mrs. Bradford Prince, Santa Fe. **New York**, Miss Gertrude Robinson Smith, 38 W. 39th St., New York. **North Carolina**, Mrs. Lindsay Patterson, Winston-Salem. **Ohio**, Mrs. George Hoadley, 2337 Grandin Road, Cincinnati. **Pennsylvania**, Mrs. John C. Groome, 1428 Walnut St., Philadelphia. **South Carolina**, Miss Jane Evans, 113 Pine St., Florence. **South Dakota**, Mrs. J. E. Bird, 110 Maple St., Watertown. **Tennessee**, Mrs. Dwight Montague, 149 East Terrace, Chattanooga. **Texas**, Mrs. Walter B. Sharp, 1404 Carter Bldg., Houston. **Vermont**, Mrs. Thornton F. Turner, North Bennington. **Virginia**, Mrs. William W. Sale, 917 Floyd St., Richmond. **Washington**, Mrs. Winfield Smith, 108 Cobb Bldg., Seattle. **Wisconsin**, Mrs. John W. Mariner, 70 Prospect Ave., Milwaukee. **Wyoming**, Mrs. R. A. Morton, Cheyenne.

The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart..Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. X

April, 1917

No. 6



The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

There are even greater words than Liberty, Equality and Rights. Lacordaire, during the revolution in France, dared to say to his countrymen: "You have written upon the monuments of your city the words Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. Above Liberty write Duty, above Fraternity write Humility, above Equality write Service, above the immemorial creed of your Rights inscribe the divine creed of your Duties."

WE MUST WIN BOTH WARS

WHAT Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, president of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, says for that organization, by order of its executive committee, as to the attitude of anti-suffragists after the declaration of war, will apply with equal or more force to the other State campaigns into which the National Association has been forced.

Readers of the *PROTEST* and members of the National Association will indorse and extend the circulation of these answers to such questions, we hope.

Every anti-suffragist, as we know, places "America First."

For that reason, we must now, of all times, place anti-suffrage second. Persons who plead for quiet submission to ruthless suffragism are in the same indefensible boat with pacifists who plead for national submission to ruthless submarine warfare.

While opposing referenda to the women in Wisconsin, Nebraska and Iowa, as they have always done wherever it has been proposed, the suffragists are trying in every State and in every country to sink the women without warning into the maelstrom of politics.

The development of the suffrage lobby which has caused several State legislatures to misrepresent the voters at the polls is similar only to the development of the submarine under Admiral Von Tirpitz. There is nothing far-fetched about this comparison.

Take the case of Ohio, which is typical. There, the suffrage lobby worked with a secret card index system, as in Illinois, kept by a woman who was shamelessly introduced at the last big suffrage meeting in New York as "the boss of the whole business." She explained how she noted each man's religion, politics, social affiliations and private family affairs in order to bring pressure to bear upon him. In other words, men were *submerged* into voting for the suffrage bill. Even at that, as explained by the *Toledo Times*, a suffrage paper:

"Representatives and senators did not as a whole vote their convictions on the bill, but looked to the referendum as a final method of disposing of the proposed reform."

But as soon as the anti-suffragists started working for the referendum, "barred zones" were announced by the suffragists.

All of their official organs, *The Woman's Journal*, *The Woman Voter*, and *The National Suffrage News* quoted a garbled extract from the United States Constitution, ruthlessly declaring that the statutory suffrage bill was not subject to a referendum to the people! (See last month's *PROTEST*, page 4.) Moreover, press reports were sent all over the country to the effect that the Attorney General of Ohio had sustained their contention. These reports were false. On March 31st, the Associated Press announced that the author of the Ohio suffrage bill had been told by Attorney General McGhee that it is subject to a referendum.

Anti-suffragists might rightly ask:

Shall we submit to submarine politics, this suffrage warfare against the rule of the people and the welfare of women?

They might also ask:

Shall the average woman's service in war-time, unselfish and unconditional, be bartered for the ballot as a "reward" when the vast majority of women, with extra duties imposed by war, most need and desire exemption from this additional burden?

But there is a more serious menace that we must face and fight—the most serious since the Civil War.

American independence may be at stake.

The adoption of woman suffrage by Federal amendment, or in several great States like New York and Ohio this year, might prove an absolute tragedy to our Government. With men at the front, the average woman's duties will be vastly increased, making it impossible for her to take an active part in politics. Taking advantage of the absence of men, and the indifference of busy women, the suffragists, working with pacifists, socialists and other radicals, could pack the legislatures and Congress itself with weak men and women. Suppose, instead of one, we had one or two hundred women pleading on the floor of Congress that they could not vote for funds to continue the war? Who might be willing to conclude an inglorious and injurious peace?

No army or navy can wage a successful war without the support of a strong, determined, efficient and experienced government.

Colorado, in 1904 and 1914, twice demonstrated that we cannot be assured of this sort of government with women voters and weak men in office. Australia, in its recent vote against universal service, has proved it. California suffragists, hissing and breaking up the meeting of the Board of Education of Berkeley on April 3d, because it suggested a resolution "which would encourage enlistments," furnish additional evidence.

"There is hardly a suffragist who is not a pacifist," says the *National Suffrage News*, official organ of the National American Woman Suffrage Association. (Editorial, February.)

"I want to stand by my country," sobs the only woman Congressman, "but I cannot vote for war. No!"

This after Miss Rankin had repeatedly declared that she wished to represent "all women," and after she had received the public indorsement of both the president of the National Woman Suffrage Association and the head of the Congressional Union!

"Miss Rankin has done nothing to be ashamed of, far from it," says Mrs. Catt. (*New York Times*, April 7th.)

Yet these suffragists, pleading nothing but a woman's weakness as reason enough for any political action their emotions may lead them to take, are trying, in the midst of war, to turn every event into a plea for "Suffrage First."

They have forced upon us, with the assistance of weak men in some State legislatures, the suffrage campaigns of the present year.

We must win them, or surrender not only our women, but our Government, to feminist politicians and pacifists whose weakness would threaten America with destruction. We must win both wars.

THE basis for all the recent publicity about woman suffrage in England is the promise that Parliament, after the war, may enfranchise women over 35! As with China, when it became a republic, the suffragists announced the day after the successful Russian revolution that women had been enfranchised. It is not yet true.

THE CONGRESSWOMAN. ACT I

A DRAMA IN THIRTEEN WORDS

IT is possible that no more dramatic scene has ever been staged in the House of Representatives than when Miss Rankin, casting her initial vote in the lower body, interrupted the roll call to say, in thirteen words, that she could not vote for war.

The Clerk of the House called Miss Rankin's name four times before she responded. The roll is always called twice in the House, the second call being for absentees on the first call. But Miss Rankin was present when her name was first read.

"Miss Rankin," droned Patrick J. Haltigan, the Reading Clerk. There was no response.

"Miss Rankin!" he repeated in a louder tone.

Practically every member in the House turned toward the seat where the "lady from Montana" sat. Those in the galleries leaned forward. Miss Rankin was evidently under great mental distress. Her appearance was that of a woman on the verge of a breakdown. She clutched at her throat repeatedly. Now and then she brushed back her hair, looked upward at the stained-glass ceiling, and rubbed her eyes and cheeks nervously. She clasped and unclasped her hands as one does under the stress of unusual emotion.

Miss Rankin's name was passed and the first roll call proceeded.

"Uncle Joe" Cannon, entering the chamber, learned that Miss Rankin, though present, had failed to vote. He spoke to her and is understood to have said:

"Little woman, you cannot afford not to vote. You represent the womanhood of the country in the American Congress. I shall not advise you how to vote, but you should vote one way or the other—as your conscience dictates."

"Miss Rankin," called the clerk. Miss Rankin started forward in her seat, then dropped backward with a look of helplessness upon her face.

"Miss Rankin," repeated the clerk.

The woman member from Montana rose slowly to her feet. Every eye was turned upon her. She swayed slightly, as her hands groped for the back of the seat in front. Her hands found it, and her fingers closed spasmodically as she steadied herself.

"I want to stand by my country—but I cannot vote for war," Miss Rankin said.

She looked straight ahead, staring at nothing in particular. Her voice trailed off into a sort of sob as Miss Rankin flung herself back into the seat, pressed her forehead and began to cry. There was a little applause, a hum of excited conversation and then silence over the chamber once more. A woman had for the first time in the nation's history participated in a legislative referendum on war.—*N. Y. Times*, April 7th.

THE inference is plain—Miss Rankin placed above country the immemorial instinct, the eternal grievance, of woman against war. Hers was the decision of emotion, of sex. The pathos of her action recalls the pitiful complaints of Hecuba, of Andromache, of Cassandra against war's cruelty to women, in "The Trojan Women" of Euripides. When Euripides wrote, four centuries before Christ, the opposition of women to war, the deep and bitter consciousness of its terror and its outrage as it affected them, was already a theme of literature. Miss Rankin's vote and her emotion prove that the motive is still strong. It is as old as the world—nor do the men of the world honor women the less for their emotional attitude in the matter.

However, the honor which American judgment will accord to Miss Rankin as a woman is an impeachment of her value as a representative in Congress. Naturally the business of the representative is to act upon deliberate judgment, upon patriotism, upon

a firm consideration of what is best and most honorable for the nation. It is a representative's business to stand with the country. If it is a question of war, the representative, if he believes it to be for the interest of the nation, votes for a course which may mean the sacrifice of his own life, or what may be much dearer to him than his life, that of his only son. He votes to bring upon his personal head woes as profound as those of Cassandra. That is patriotism and public spirit. In our age of the world, many noble women invite these sorrows without a murmur, without a tear. They place the need of country above their own need, above their own happiness. For this they are honored above all other women. But this Miss Rankin does not do. Putting aside not only her duty as a representative but what should be her predominant devotion to her country, she harks back to Cassandra and "The Trojan Women," and votes "no," because her feminine emotions will not permit her to say "yes" to war.

The incident, which all must respect, is a new proof that the participation of women in public affairs may, if it is to be deemed an advantage, be one which is purchased at the price of less deliberation, less judgment, less patriotism in the settlement of our public affairs, and more emotion, more sighs, more tears.—*Boston Transcript* (Editorial).

PATRIOTISM WITH A "BUT"

IN casting as she did her first vote in the House of Representatives, Miss Jeannette Rankin assumed a responsibility that was heavier, perhaps, than she realized, though the emotion she displayed while doing it showed her realization that it was not a light one. It was a heavier responsibility, in one way, than would have been incurred by a man from the same section of the country who had voted in the same wrong way. For Miss Rankin did not represent merely a Congressional District. She also represented women, or at least women in politics and taking part in public affairs, and a man would not have represented, in quite the same sense, his sex and its activities.

The lady from Montana was there in the House as an exponent and as an exemplar of woman suffrage attained. Only a few days before she had been recognized and feted as such by eminent and authorized leaders of that movement, and those leaders, it can fairly be assumed, spoke for the great majority, if not all, of their followers. Unless they and their followers promptly and vigorously—and convincingly—proclaim disapproval of Miss Rankin's vote, it will also be fair to assume that what she did other suffrage women in the same position would have done, and that if they had been in a majority of the House, the resolution would have been lost. That is a contingency that cannot be contemplated with composure, and certainly it is one to make many men who hitherto have favored woman suffrage become its antagonists—to make many other men who have not cared much about it either way turn against it.

Miss Rankin's statement, too, in explanation of her vote—she evidently felt that it needed defense—was significant. "I want to stand by my country," she said, "but I cannot vote for war." Her allegiance is therefore conditional—an unsatisfactory and dangerous kind. Had she said, "I stand by my country and therefore I vote against war," her logical attitude would have been different and better, though, of course, the premises from which her conclusion was reached would still be open to attack. Apart from the question of woman suffrage, this beginning of Miss Rankin's career as a national legislator is most unfortunate for her. She starts wrong, for she has justified distrust of her judgment and of her opinions.

New York Times, April 7, 1917 (Editorial).

WHY WOMEN DO NOT WISH THE SUFFRAGE

By REV. LYMAN ABBOTT, D. D.

Reprinted, by permission, from the *Atlantic Monthly*.

IN 1895 the women of Massachusetts were asked by the State whether they wished the suffrage. Of the 575,000 voting women in the state, only 22,204 cared for it enough to deposit in a ballot box an affirmative answer to this question. That is, in round numbers, less than four per cent. wished to vote; about ninety-six per cent. were opposed to woman suffrage or indifferent to it. That this expresses fairly well the average sentiment throughout the country can hardly be questioned. There may be some Western states in which the proportion of women who, for one reason or another, desire the suffrage is somewhat larger; on the other hand, there are Southern states in which it is even less. Certainly few men or women will doubt that at the present time an overwhelming majority of women are either reluctant to accept the ballot or indifferent to it. Why this indifference, this reluctance? This is the question which in this article I seek to answer. Briefly, I believe it is because woman feels, if she does not clearly see, that the question of woman suffrage is more than merely political; that it concerns the nature and structure of society,—the home, the church, the industrial organism, the state, the social fabric. And to a change which involves a revolution in all of these she interposes an inflexible though generally a silent opposition. It is for these silent women that I speak; it is their unspoken thought and feeling I wish to interpret.

Open an acorn: in it we find the oak in all its parts,—root, trunk, branches. Look into the home: in it we shall find the state, the church, the army, the industrial organization. As the oak is germinant in the acorn, so society is germinant in the family. Historically, the family is the first organization; biologically it is the origin of all other organizations. Abraham builds an altar, and his wife and children and servants gather about it for the evening sacrifice: the family is the first church. The herds and flocks are driven daily to their feeding grounds by his sons and servants: the family is the first labor organization. He counsels, guides, directs, controls the children and servants; the power of life and death is in his hands: the family is the first government. The brother is carried off in a raid by robber bands. Abraham arms and organizes his servants; pursues the robber bands, conquers and disperses them, and recovers the captive: the family is the first army. Moreover, it is out of the family that society grows. As the cell duplicates itself, and by reduplication the living organism grows, so the family duplicates itself, and by the reduplication of the family the social organism grows. The children of the family come to manhood, and marry the children of other families. Blood unites them; the necessities of warfare, offensive and defensive, unite them; and so the tribe comes into existence. For the united action of this tribe some rule, some authority is necessary; thus tribal, state, national government comes into existence. These families find it for their mutual advantage to engage in separate industries, and exchange the product of their labor: thus barter and trade and the whole industrial organization come into existence.

Such, very briefly stated, is the development of society as we read it in the complicated history of the past. Historically the family is the first social organization. Organically it contains within itself all the elements of all future organization. Biologically, all future organization has grown out of it, by a process of duplication and interrelationship. In the family, therefore, we find all the elements of a later and more complicated social organization; in the family we may discover written legibly the laws which should determine the structure of society and should

regulate its action; the family, rightly understood, will answer our often perplexing questions concerning social organization—whether it is military, political, industrial, or religious.

The first and most patent fact in the family is the difference in the sexes. Out of this difference the family is created; in this difference the family finds its sweet and sacred bond. This difference is not merely physical and incidental. It is also psychical and essential. It inheres in the temperament; it is inbred in the very fiber of the soul; it differentiates the functions; it determines the relation between man and woman; it fixes their mutual service and their mutual obligations. Man is not woman in a different case. Woman is not man inhabiting temporarily a different kind of body. Man is not a rough-and-tumble woman. Woman is not a feeble and pliable man.

This difference in the sexes is the first and fundamental fact in the family; it is therefore the first and fundamental fact in society, which is but a large family, growing out of and produced by the duplication and interrelationship of innumerable families. For it must ever be remembered that as the nature of the cell determines the nature of the organism which grows out of the cell, so the nature of the family determines the nature of society which grows out of the family. And the fundamental fact, without which there could be no family, is the temperamental, inherent, and therefore functional difference between the sexes.

Because their functions are different, all talk of equality or non-equality is but idle words, without a meaning. Only things which have the same nature and fulfil the same function can be said to be superior to or equal with one another. Things which do not fulfil the same function are not thus comparable. For of two functions, each of which is essential to the life of the organism, neither can be said to be superior to the other. One branch may be equal or superior to another branch; but it cannot be said that the root is superior to the branch or the branch to the root. One eye may be superior to another eye, but the eye cannot be said to be superior to the ear, or the ear to the eye. Which is superior, a soldier or a carpenter? It depends upon whether we want a battle fought or a house built. Which is superior, Darwin's "Origin of Species" or Browning's "Saul"? This is like asking which is larger—half an hour or half a yard? Gallantry will bow to woman and say, "You are superior." Egotism will look with lordly air on woman and say, "You are inferior." But neither gallantry nor egotism will be rational. These twain are not identical. They do not duplicate each other. Man is not an inferior woman. Woman is not an inferior man. They are different in nature, in temperament, in function. We cannot destroy this difference if we would; we would not if we could. In preserving it lies the joy of the family; the peace, prosperity and well-being of society. If man attempts woman's function, he will prove himself but an inferior woman. If woman attempts man's function, she will prove herself but an inferior man. Some masculine women there are; some feminine men there are. These are the monstrosities of Nature. This distinction between the sexes—inherent, temperamental, functional—is universal and perpetual. It underlies the family, which could not exist if this difference did not exist. It is to be taken account of in all social problems—problems of industrial organization, religious organization, political organization. Should society ever forget it, it would forget the most fundamental fact in the social order, the fact on which is built the whole superstructure of society.

It may not be altogether easy to determine the exact difference in function between the sexes; in minor details those functions may differ in differing civilizations. But speaking broadly, it may

be said that the work of battle in all its forms, and all the work that is cognate thereto, belongs to man. Physically and psychically his is the sterner and the stronger sex. His muscles are more steel-like; his heart and his flesh are alike harder; he can give knocks without compunction and receive them without shrinking. In the family, therefore, his it is to go forth and fight the battle with Nature; to compel the reluctant ground to give her riches to his use. It is not for woman to hold the plough, or handle the hoe, or dig in the mine, or fell the forest. The war with Nature is not for her to wage. It is true that savage tribes impose this unfeminine task upon her; true that modern nations which have not yet fully emerged from barbarism continue to do so; true, also, that in the cruel industrial competitions of modern times there is, in some communities, a relapse into this barbarism. But whether it is the Indian squaw digging in the corn patch, or the German *Frau* holding the plough, or the American wife working the loom in her husband's place—wherever man puts the toil that is battle and the battle that is toil upon the woman, the law of Nature, that is, the law of God, written in her constitution and in the constitution of the family, is set at naught. This is not to say that her toil is less than man's; but it is different. It may be easier to be the man with the hoe than the woman with the needle; it may be easier to handle the plough than to broil over the cook stove; but these tasks are not the same. The ceaseless toil of the field requires exhaustless energy; the continuous toil of the household requires exhaustless patience. Being a man, the exhaustless patience seems to me at once more difficult and more admirable than the exhaustless energy. But they are not the same.

For like reason it is not woman's function to fight against human foes who threaten the home. She is not called to be a soldier. She is not to be welcomed with the volunteers nor coerced into military service by the draft. It is in vain to recite the story of "Joan of Arc"; it is in vain to narrate the efforts of the Amazons. The instinct of humanity revolts against the employment of woman as a soldier on the battlefield. No civilized man would wish to lay this duty upon her; no civilized woman would wish to assume it. This is not to say that her courage is not as great as his. Greater is it in some sense—but it is different. For the Spartan mother to arm her son and send him forth with the injunction to come home bringing his shield or borne upon it, and then wait during the long and weary days to know which way he is to come—this requires, surely, a heroism not less than his; but it is not the same heroism; higher in some sense it is—but it is not the same. In his courage are pride and combativeness and animal passion, sometimes well-nigh devilish passion; a strange joy in giving and receiving wounds, a music that grows inspiring in the singing of the bullets, an almost brutal indifference to the wounded and the dying all about him, which she could never get and remain woman. True to her woman's nature is Lady Macbeth's prayer—

"Come, you spirits

That tend on mortal thoughts, *unsex* me here."

For until she had been unsexed, until she had ceased to be woman, she could not play the part which her destiny and her ambition assigned to her.

For like reason society exempts woman from police functions. She is not called to be sheriff or constable or night watchman. She bears no truncheon and wears no revolver. She answers not to the summons when peace officers call for the *posse comitatus*. She is not received into the National Guard when bloody riot fills the city with peril and alarms. Why not? Is she not the equal of man? Is she not as loyal? as law abiding? as patriotic? as brave? Surely, All of these is she. But it is not her function to protect the State when foreign foes attack it; it is the function of the state to protect her. It is not her function to protect the persons and property of the community against riot; it is man's function to protect her. Here at least the functional

difference between the sexes is too plain to be denied, doubted or ignored. Here at least no man or woman from the claim of equality of character jumps to the illogical conclusion that there is an identity of function.

This much then seems clear to me, and I hope it is clear to the reader also:

First, that the family is the basis of society, from which it grows.

Second, that the basis of the family, and therefore of society, is the difference between the sexes—a difference which is inherent, temperamental, functional.

Third, that the military function, in all its forms and phases, belongs to man; that he has no right to thrust it upon woman or to ask her to share it with him; that it is his duty, and his exclusively, to do that battling with the elements which wrests livelihood from a reluctant or resisting Nature, and which is therefore the pre-requisite to all productive industry; and that battling with the enemies of society which compels them to respect its rights, and which is therefore the primary condition of government.

For the object of government is the protection of person, property and reputation from the foes which assail them. Government may do other things: it may carry the mails, run the express, own and operate the railroads; but its fundamental function is to furnish protection from open violence or secret fraud. If it adequately protects person, property and reputation, it is a just government, though it do nothing else; if it fails to protect these primary rights, if the person is left to defend himself, his property, his reputation by his own strong arm, there is no government. The question, "Shall woman vote?" is really, in the last analysis, the question, "Ought woman to assume the responsibility for protecting person and property which has in the past been assumed by man as his duty alone?" It is because women see, what some so-called reformers have not seen, that the first and fundamental function of government is the protection of person and property, and because women do not think that they ought to assume this duty any more than they ought to assume that police and militia service which is involved in every act of legislature, that they do not wish to have the ballot thrust upon them.

Let us not here make any mistake. Nothing is law which has not *authority* behind it; and there is no real authority where there is not *power* to compel obedience. It is this power to compel which distinguishes law from advice. Behind every law stands the sheriff, and behind the sheriff the militia, and behind the militia the whole military power of the Federal Government. No legislature ever ought to enact a statute unless it is ready to pledge all the power of government—local, State and Federal—to its enforcement, if the statute is disregarded. A ballot is not a mere expression of opinion; it is an act of the will; and behind this act of the will must be power to compel obedience. Women do not wish authority to compel the obedience of their husbands, sons and brothers to their will.

This fact that the ballot is explicitly an act of the will, and implicitly an expression of power or force, is indicated not only by the general function of government, but also by special illustrations. Politics is pacific war. A corrupt ring gets the control of New York City, or Minneapolis, or St. Louis, or Philadelphia, or perhaps of a State, as Delaware, Rhode Island or Montana. The first duty of the citizens is to make war on this corrupt ring. The ballot is not merely an expression of opinion that this ring ought not to control; it is the resolve that it shall not control. If the vote does not mean this, it is nothing more than a resolution passed in a parlor meeting. The great elections are called, and not improperly called, campaigns. For they are more than a great debate. A debate is a clash of opinions. But an election is a clash of wills. Will sets itself against will in what is essentially a masculine encounter. And if the defeated will

refuses to accept the decision, as it did when Mr. Lincoln was elected President, war is the necessary result.

From such an encounter of wills woman instinctively shrinks. She shrinks from it exactly as she shrinks from the encounter of opposing wills on a battlefield, and for the same reason. She is glad to counsel; she is loath to command. She does not wish to arm herself, and, as police or soldier, enforce her will on the community. Nor does she wish to register her will, and leave her son, her brother or her husband to enforce it. If she can persuade them by womanly influence she will; but just in the measure in which she is womanly, she is unwilling to say to her son, to her brother or to her husband, "I have decreed this; you must see that my decree is enforced on the reluctant or the resisting." She does not wish that he should act on her judgment against his own in obedience to her will; still less that he shall, in obedience to her will, compel others to act in violation both of their judgment and of his. And yet this is just what suffrage always may and sometimes must involve. The question, Shall woman vote, if translated into actual and practical form, reads thus: Shall woman decide what are the rights of the citizen to be protected and what are the duties of the citizen to be enforced, and then are her son and her brother and her husband to go forth, armed, if need be, to enforce her decision? Is this where the functional line between the sexes is to be drawn? Are women to make the laws, and men to enforce them? Are women to decree, and men to execute? Is woman never to act as a private, but only as a commander-in-chief? Is this right? Is it right that one sex shall alone enforce authority, but the other sex determine when and how it shall be exercised? Is this expedient? Will it promote peace, order, prosperity? Is it practicable? Will it in fact be done? Suppose that in New York City the women should vote for prohibition and the men should vote against it; is it to be expected that the men would arm themselves to enforce against their fellow men a law which they themselves condemned as neither wise nor just? To ask these questions is to answer them. The functions of government cannot be thus divided. In a democratic community the duty of enforcing the law must devolve on those who determine what the law shall be that is to be enforced. It cannot be decreed by one class and enforced by another. It is inconceivable that it should be decreed by one sex and enforced by the other.

This is the negative reason why woman does not wish the ballot; she does not wish to engage in that conflict of wills which is the essence of politics; she does not wish to assume the responsibility for protecting person and property which is the essence of government. The affirmative reason is that she has other, and in some sense, more important work to do. It is more important than the work of government because it is the work for the protection of which governments are organized among men. Woman does not wish to turn aside from this higher work, which is itself the end of life, to devote herself to government, which exists only that this higher work may be done. Nor does she wish to divide her energies between the two. This higher work, which is itself the end of life, is Direct Ministry to Life.

What are we in the world for? The family answers the question. As the family is historically the first organization, as it is biologically the unit out of which all other social organisms are formed, so its protection and maintenance are the objects for which all other social organizations have been called into existence and are maintained. Struggle for others, as Professor Drummond has well shown, is an even more vital element in human progress than struggle for self; and in the family this struggle for others receives its first and finest illustration. Political economists have told us that self-interest is the mainspring of industry. It is not true. Love is the mainspring of industry. It is love for the home and the wife and the children that keeps all the busy wheels of industry revolving, that calls the factory hands early to the mill, that

nerves the arm of the blacksmith working at his forge, that inspires the farmer at his plough and the merchant at his desk, that gives courage to the soldier and patience to the teacher. Erskine was asked how he dared, as an unknown barrister, face a hostile court and insist on his right to be heard. "I felt my children," he replied, "tugging at my robe and saying, 'Here is your chance, father, to get us bread.'" It is this vision of the children, dependent on us, that inspires us all in the battle of life. It is for our homes and our children we maintain our churches. They are not spiritual restaurants where we pay for our own food passed over the counter to us by an attendant priest; they are the instrument, which some of us think God has created, others of us think man has devised, to help us endow our children and equip our homes for life. It is for our homes and our children we tax ourselves to maintain the public school; for our homes and our children we maintain government, that our loved ones may live in peace and safety, protected by law, while we, their natural protectors, are away earning the bread wherewith to feed them; for our homes and our children we fight when peace and safety are endangered, and government is assailed by foreign foe or domestic violence. Whether we cultivate a farm, or operate a factory, or manage a store, or build and conduct a railroad, or paint pictures, or write books, or preach sermons, or enact and enforce laws—whatever we do, the end of our activity is the nurture and training of children in this primary school, which we call life, in preparation for some life, we know not what, hereafter.

In this work of direct ministry to the individual, this work of character-building, which is the ultimate end of life, woman takes the first place. The higher the civilization the more clearly is her right to it recognized. She builds the home, and she keeps the home. She makes the home sanitary; she inspires it with the spirit of order, neatness and peace; she broods it with her patient love, and teaches us to love by her loving. Her eye discerns beauty, her deft fingers create it, and to her the home is indebted for its artistic power to educate. If she has not the artistic sense, no purchased beauty, bought of a professional decorator, can supply the vacancy. She instills into the little child the love of truth and purity, the subtle sense of honor, the strong spirit of courage and high purpose. If her home duties do not absorb her time and energy, she seeks the field of charity or education, or accepts the invitation which these fields offer to her. She becomes a director in or a visitor to some of the innumerable charities in which life is ministered to the unfortunate, the feeble, the incompetent. If we accept Micah's definition of religion, To do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly with God, then we may say that, with rare exceptions, woman chooses to leave to man the sterner task of administering justice, and delights herself in the ministration of mercy. She does so because in these unpaid ministries of mercy, sometimes in institutions, sometimes in private and unorganized service, is the direct impartation of life which is her highest joy. If she has no home in which she can and does minister, she instinctively seeks the schoolroom as her field, and there, substituting for the mother, imparts life, and endows with intelligence, and equips with culture the children intrusted to her charge. If necessity drives her or ambition entices her to other fields, her womanly instinct still asserts itself. If she enters the law, it is generally to be a counselor rather than a combatant; if literature, her pen instinctively seeks the vital rather than the materialistic themes. She is a minister to life. And when mistakenly ambitious women would persuade her to leave this ministry for the woodman's axe, the farmer's plough or the policeman's truncheon, she does not even entertain the proposition enough to discuss it.

And she is right. If she were to go into politics, she would leave undone the work for which alone government exists, or she would distract her energies from that work, which she knows

full well requires them all. Can she not do both? No! no more than man can. He cannot be at the same time in the market winning the bread, in the forum shaping the public policies, and in the home ministering to life. Nor can she. She must choose. She may give her time and thought and energy to building a State, and engaging in that warfare of wills which politics involves; or she may give her time and thought to the building of men, on whose education and training, church, State, industry, society, all depend. She has made her choice and made it wisely. Necessity, born of an imperfect industrial system, may drive a few thousand women into battle with Nature in bread-winning

vocations; ambition may call a few women down and out from the higher vocation of character-building to participate in public debate before the footlights; the clamors of an ill-instructed conscience may force a few more to leave the congenial work of directly ministering to life, that they may undertake the more indirect ministry through village or city boards, State legislatures and the Federal Congress; but the great body of American women are true to themselves, to the nature God has given them, and to the service He has allotted to them—the direct ministry to life—and will neither be forced nor enticed from it by their restless, well-meaning, but mistaken sisters.

DISCRIMINATING AGAINST MOTHER

By MRS. MARGARET C. ROBINSON
President, Public Interests League of Massachusetts

A BILL has recently been passed in Vermont which gives municipal suffrage to women who pay taxes. A prominent Boston newspaper, in an editorial called "Discriminating Against Mother," calls attention to the fact that this "puts the woman with several dogs and a motor" above the woman whose wealth consists of the "strength, virtue and patriotism of her children."

Not only tax-paying suffrage but woman suffrage in general "discriminates against mother." It puts her politically at a tremendous disadvantage with the unmarried woman, the female agitator, the idle rich and the woman of the streets, all of whom may have the time and some of them the inclination to play the political game. What is happening in the cities where women vote? Just what anti-suffragists have always predicted. The great mass of women stay at home on election day, and the small group of women reformers, who without the vote had great influence for good, are out-voted by the women whose votes can be controlled by the vicious interests and the bosses. It is claimed that the recent outrageous reaction toward corruption in Chicago is due to this stay-at-home vote. During the four years since women have voted in that city, Chicago seemingly had plumbed the depths in lawlessness, graft, immorality and dishonesty among both aldermen and the police force; but worse is apparently yet to come, as at the recent primaries all the best candidates were defeated and the worse ones elected. The *Chicago Post* says: "The first reason for this was the keeping of the independent vote at home; 'the gang' never stays at home."

Women leaders in Chicago blame mother—she stayed at home, while "the gang" saw to it that its female voters were at the polls. But what right have these leaders to blame mother? She didn't ask for the vote and didn't want it. Mrs. Medill McCormick, Antoinette Funk, Mrs. Trout and Mrs. McCulloch, four Chicago suffragists, secretly lobbied the suffrage bill through the legislature without mother's knowledge or consent; what right had they to try to force her into politics in this underhand way? It is they, not mother, who are to blame for the appallingly vicious conditions which make Chicago a sink of iniquity; a place according to Mrs. Joseph G. Bowen, head of the Juvenile Protective Association, where "even well-intentioned young people in search of recreation walk a road, at the present moment, easily leading to destruction." When mother has protested against being forced into politics, suffragists have always lightly answered: "Oh, you needn't vote if you don't want to. But you mustn't prevent me from voting." We are seeing in Chicago, Seattle, San Francisco and Denver how it works to have mother stay at home. A woman writer in the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* of March 4, 1917, says that while some intelligent women interested in political issues do vote, the women who are tools of unscrupulous politicians vote also, while the overwhelming majority of women refuse to take part in politics.

In Seattle, as well as in Chicago, "mother" doesn't vote—she

stays at home. There, too, the attempt to force her into politics was made without her consent, and there, too, corruption is rampant.

Woman suffrage therefore strengthens the vicious interests in our cities and puts additional power into the hands of a certain type of politician. At the present time a small group of women with millions of dollars at their command are using all the arts of the female lobby and the cleverest political skill which money can buy, to bring about conditions similar to those in Chicago in all our cities. They are working to bring about a system of "discrimination against mother" which is taking away her property rights. Under woman suffrage, women in California have already lost their Homestead rights. It brings hardship to mother in forcing her to serve on juries. In the big I. W. W. murder trial now going on in Seattle, which is likely to last two months, six of the jurors are women. One of them received word after the trial started that her children had measles. The judge said: "I am powerless to let you go home, but I may communicate to you any word your family physician desires to convey. Don't let your attention be attracted by anything but the trial." Pleasant for mother, isn't it? If "mother" is a widow and owns a little home, woman suffrage brings hardship upon her in the form of great increase of taxes. In Illinois taxes have jumped in some places 190% since 1912, when the vote was given to women. Worst of all, woman suffrage works injury to mother in bringing about conditions in our cities which are a menace to the moral welfare of her children.

All along the line it discriminates against mother, who has neither time nor inclination to play the political game, in favor of the female politician, the idle rich, the ignorant woman and the woman of the streets. Politicians who believe they can easily control this class of votes are flocking to the suffrage standard. A suffragist in Florida recently told of an interview she had had with a Florida politician who boasted that he had kept Florida wet by buying the negro vote, and he added, "when women get the vote I will buy the negro woman's vote and can get pretty much what I want." The suffragist naively told this tale to show what a bad man he was, apparently oblivious of the fact that she was proposing to put great additional power in the hands of just such men. The fight is now between the suffragists and a certain type of politician on one hand, with millions of money at their command, and the people on the other. The future well-being of our country depends on the result. If the suffragists win, we shall see an appalling increase of political and moral corruption in all our cities as we have seen in Chicago; taxes will increase by leaps and bounds; socialism and feminism will spread with the same rapidity in our country as in Norway, Finland and New Zealand, where the evil results of woman suffrage are now clearly in evidence. In working to bring about these results, suffragists are without question "discriminating against mother."

THE CONTRAST OF A CHART WITH THE TRUTH. II

By MINNIE BRONSON

General Secretary National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

SINCE my article in the WOMAN'S PROTEST for February, pointing out the many egregious blunders in the suffrage chart published in the *Woman's Journal* of January 20th, the suffragists have made another little toy target, correcting about fifty of the "blunders" on the original chart.

The new chart made its debut in the *National Suffrage News* for February. The *News* is an official organ of the National American Woman Suffrage Association.

"This is the only chart of the kind so far issued with the sanction of the National American Woman Suffrage Association," reads a notice beneath the new chart. "Acknowledgment is made to Mrs. J. D. Holman, of St. Paul, for the ingenious device whereby the showing is made," we are also informed.

Mrs. Holman was probably the author of the original "ingenious," but not ingenuous, chart which first appeared in the *Woman's Journal*, another official suffrage organ.

The "ingenious" method is continued in the new chart. But the legends and conclusions printed with the new chart are even more "ingenious" than those of the former chart.

The nine selected laws are given again—with twenty or more errors—and the black spaces are counted up to form the basis for a statement wholly unwarranted by the facts. The legend says:

"There are in the twelve suffrage States thirty-two black spaces in all, an average of 2.66.

"There are in the thirty-six non-suffrage [male suffrage?] States 186 black spaces, an average of 5.16.

"Judged by social legislation, women and children are, therefore, nearly twice as well off in suffrage as in non-suffrage States."

These "ingenious" statements are of the type that excited a long-suffering editor about two years ago to write, in the *Unpopular Review*, June, 1915:

"If would-be reformers could once be persuaded that they injure, each his own cause, and all the cause of improvement in general, by the attempt to bolster up their schemes by ill-considered and false accusations and charges, they would certainly devote more time to verification and less to vociferation."

The new chart shows that only three of the eleven full suffrage States have "good" child labor laws.

The chart also shows that twenty-three of the States where women do not have full suffrage have "good" child labor laws.

Therefore, a child is "seven times as well off" without full suffrage for women, if we use the same method by which the National Suffrage Association is attempting to "put over" a misleading statement.

Similarly, although the suffrage chart does not show it, fourteen States provide a 54-hour or six-day week, averaging nine hours a day or less, for women in industry.

Only three of these States have woman suffrage.

In ten States, women are protected from night labor.

Only three have woman suffrage.

Therefore, working women are "more than three times as well off" without the vote, according to the suffrage chart system.

Also, there are twenty-five States with Prohibition.

Only seven of these States went "dry" with women voting.

Eighteen went "dry" under male suffrage.

Therefore, male suffrage States are nearly "three times as dry" as States where women vote, according to the "ingenious device."

To sum up, there has been from three to seven times as much progressive legislation enacted under man suffrage as with women voting, as shown in the following table:

	(a) Under Man Suffrage	(b) With Women Voting
1. Good Child Labor Laws adopted in...	23 States	3 States
2. 54-hour or six-day week, averaging 9 hours a Day or Less for Working Women	11 States	3 States
3. Night work prohibited for women...	7 States	3 States
4. Prohibition adopted.....	18 States	7 States
Total Score.....	59	16

In passing, it may be remarked that Wyoming, with woman suffrage forty-eight years, has none of the progressive legislation cited above, while Colorado, with woman suffrage twenty-four years, has none but prohibition. Colorado adopted prohibition twenty-two years after women were enfranchised. It has neither a good child labor law nor a fifty-four-hour or six-day week, nor prohibition of night work for working women, although it has an eight-hour day in some establishments.

No State with woman suffrage has all of these good measures, while several male suffrage States have all of them, except prohibition, and Nebraska, a male suffrage neighbor to both Colorado and Wyoming, has them all! (See footnote.)

Notwithstanding these facts, suffragists seem to prefer to juggle them on a percentage basis, including the Southern States to make the proportion of States without woman suffrage appear backward in good legislation, while ignoring straight comparisons of the number of States adopting progressive measures with or without woman suffrage.

If anti-suffragists were to take account of the comparative population of the States, it would appear that from five to twenty times as many women and children are protected by good "man-made" laws as are living under equally good legislation in the States where women have full suffrage.

Suffrage statistics always remind me of two women of my acquaintance, whom I shall call Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Brown.

Mrs. Jones had four children, and at the time to which I refer, two of them had the measles. In other words, 50 per cent. of her children were sick.

Mrs. Brown had one child, who had the measles, making 100 per cent. of Mrs. Brown's children sick with the measles. Thus Mrs. Jones, with only 50 per cent. of her children sick, actually had twice as much labor, twice as much to pay the doctor, twice as many sick children to care for as Mrs. Brown.

However, were Mrs. Jones a suffragist and Mrs. Brown an anti, we can all picture Mrs. Jones loudly proclaiming that her children were only half as sick as Mrs. Brown's!

The "ingenious" statements are not the only mistakes of this revised chart. Space does not permit an extended criticism, but a few instances will disclose the utter unreliability of the "authorized" chart.

Louisiana and Arizona are represented in black in the child labor circle, but Bulletin No. 248 of the National Child Labor Committee, entitled "What State Laws and the Federal Census Say About Child Labor" places these States in the list having the best provisions for children under fourteen.

Oregon, on the other hand, is printed in the authorized suffrage chart in white. The same bulletin of the National Child Labor Committee shows that while Oregon's child labor law, passed before women voted, had entitled that State to a place in the list with the best provisions, since the women have voted in Oregon, the law has been amended so that the bulletin now lists the State under "States Weakening or Nullifying Standard Provisions by Exemptions."

In fact, the bulletin, corrected to date, shows that Oregon is the only State to have gone backward in child labor legislation since the bulletin was issued in July, 1915! And this under woman suffrage.

(a) Under Male Suffrage:

- Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Wisconsin.—Table 1, Pamphlet 248, National Child Labor Committee, corrected to April, 1917.
- Arkansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas.—Working Hours for Women, American Labor Legislation Review, December, 1916.
- Connecticut, Indiana, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina.—Ibid.
- Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas (thirty-two years before women voted), Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia.

(b) Under Woman Suffrage:

- Arizona, Kansas, Montana. 2. California, Oregon, Utah. 3. Kansas, Oregon, Utah. 4. Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Utah, Washington.

WOMAN AS SUPREME ARCHITECT

By MRS. W. K. ROBBINS

Reprinted from the *National Magazine*

REFORMERS are naturally and inevitably enthusiasts, more or less fanatical. The fact that, in this form of social upheaval known as Woman Suffrage, the leaders are exclusively women, makes sober discussion of the question difficult, if not reckless.

A large majority of women have very decided convictions against the granting of suffrage to women, but few have the temerity to express them, even in a mild and didactic way, for the reason that—mosquito bites are uncomfortable.

Having been urged by the editor of the *National* to give some of the results of my observation and experience on the subject of Woman Suffrage, it will be the purpose of this paper to be fair and discriminating, in the face of mosquitoes, and perchance, an occasional wasp.

Under the deluge of suffrage literature now descending upon their defenseless heads, thinking women in ever-increasing numbers are asking two leading questions: How will votes for women affect the State? And: How will the ballot affect women? In other words: Will suffrage benefit government? Will it improve society? The answers will be sought in the theoretical claims of the suffragists and in the results of experiments, carried on mainly in our western States.

The shifting position on the main point of their argument comes near "throwing the case out of court." For many years they placed the emphasis upon the point of a natural and inalienable right of the governed to participate in government. They contended that the State owes women the ballot, just as it does protection of her life and property.

When it was found that all jurists from Chief Justice Marshall to Judge Cooley, the highest authority on constitutional law, unite in the decision that "Suffrage cannot be the right of the individual because it does not exist for the benefit of the individual, but for the benefit of the State," and the obvious fact recalled that no one advocates unlimited suffrage for every man, woman and child in the United States; it therefore follows that the State has the right to discriminate to grant or to withhold in the matter of the franchise. Obviously it is not a natural right but a conferred privilege and obligation. In view of these decisions the emphasis was transferred about 1914 from natural right to expediency.

Then was eloquently pointed out the great benefit to government and society which would follow in the wake of Woman Suffrage. All brands of political corruption, the saloon, the brothel, white slavery, the double standard, woman's low wage and long hours, unsanitary conditions, poor schools and many other evils would be outlawed or much diminished. Unfortunately for this attractive program, two illuminating barriers stood in the way: *Woman* herself—a large majority of her—and *records*—the published results of experiments carried on in some of our western States where suffrage has been in operation for periods of from three to forty-six years.

Taking the last impediment, first—the sincere truth seeker is interested in a parallel column of the betterment laws enacted in any double suffrage State and those passed in Massachusetts, which Mrs. Post, the paid agitator imported into New Hampshire, describes as "left behind in the procession of the world's progress." Massachusetts is on record as inaugurating more helpful laws than any other State in the Union, as leading in laws designed for the protection of women and children. Massachusetts led in prison reform, the probation system for husbands guilty of non-support, workmen's compensation law, prohibiting night work and long hours for women and children, child labor, in granting mother's pensions, minimum wage for women, joint ownership of property, and equal guardianship of children. These and many more, looking to the physical, mental and moral welfare of woman, enacted and enforced by men's vote alone, constitute a matchless record.

The important part women have played in this proud achievement will be pointed out later. It is enough here to record the fact that women can best serve the State outside the realm of political contention.

In the twenty-one-years-old suffrage State of Colorado, at a suffrage banquet in Denver in 1915, one speaker, Judge Lindsey, a Colorado suffragist, declared, "We are twenty years behind Massachusetts in spite of suffrage. We have suffrage, but our

dependent children are in institutions instead of being given the rights of family ties." At another time he exclaims, "Here in Colorado corruption in public office has been made a science."

In California, under the old regime, a married woman could buy homesteading and exempt \$5,000 from any debt owed by her husband. Now under the new equality the wife is liable for all debts of the husband, for household expenses, and can be sued for alimony. In San Francisco, according to the April *Survey*, of which Jane Addams is assistant editor, "Prostitution is frankly and openly tolerated and that the city is fast becoming the mecca for the underworld and for every such addition the problem is rendered that much more difficult, for the reason that such importations necessarily vote for the party in power, while the good women vote Republican, Democrat or other partisan. The saloon flourishes here, guarantee pledged by a two hundred thousand majority vote of men and women.

Equal pay for men and women has not been realized in suffrage States. In Massachusetts women receive sixty-two per cent. as much as men, while in Colorado they receive only forty-seven per cent.

It is not the ballot that raises pay, or men would not need to resort to strikes and labor unions; and even then seek jobs, in numbers ten-fold that of women looking for employment. The law of supply and demand controls wages—not equal pay for equal time, but equal pay for equal service. Women's gainful service can never equal man's, for one reason among others that a woman's industrial life averages only five years, seventy per cent. graduating into matrimony, while a man expects to be on his job a lifetime.

Now, since the State derives no benefit in the maintenance of safety, and of law and order, from extending the ballot to women, who, in overwhelming majorities, do not want it, and therefore would not use it, the question naturally arises: Where is the return for doubling the expenses in convincing the voter (where he and she are not bought), and in providing and operating increased election machinery? The sarcastic and unpatriotic allusions to our country's history and laws, made in recent suffrage literature and oratory, promotes disrespect for law, to a degree second only to that engendered by the enacting of laws that cannot be enforced.

Nothing breeds contempt for law like the unpunished violation of it.

Woman, naturally and properly, emotional and autocratic, flies to legislation, as she makes laws against Johnny eating with his knife. She as energetically repeals a law that fails to work out as she had planned or re-elects a mayor of Seattle upon whom she, a few months before, had visited the disgrace of a recall from office, just as she tells Johnny to eat with his knife or fingers rather than go hungry or be late at school. This point is abundantly illustrated by the sporadic prohibition laws passed in many communities throughout the country.

In a town where public opinion is not educated up to the blessings of abstinence, a prohibition law is sometimes passed through the efforts of some spellbinder's efforts. Before the ink is dry on the published law, the heat of emotion has disappeared, and that particular law becomes a by-word, and all law loses majesty with the easy-going citizen.

Another menace to democracy lies in the curious fact that the proportion of qualified voters, actually voting, is much smaller in the double suffrage States, a group of six averaging 47.9 per cent., than it is in six adjoining men suffrage States, which averaged 69.1 per cent.

The election in Chicago last spring is illuminating when we look beyond the confused registry and vote. Of the men eligible to vote, 84.7 exercised their right, while only 49.9 per cent. of the women actually voted, with the incentive of questions of unusual concern before the voters, and, moreover, the ballot was new.

This diminution of interest in election is due either to the lack of interest on the part of women in the results of voting, or it is chargeable, according to the evidence of natives, to the fact that men take the ballot less seriously, where women participate. Either horn of the dilemma leaves much to be desired as a pointer

on the road to more efficient democracy. Leaving the enfranchised woman with her disappointments, it is a pleasure to note the splendid service which woman, without the ballot, has rendered to the stability of popular government. The value of this service increases with the higher development of women, all of which growth is due to opportunities for higher education, secured without the ballot.

Since the efficiency of popular government must always and everywhere depend on the intelligence and honesty of the individual, it is obvious that ultimately it is upon woman in her capacity of mother and teacher that the entire structure of government rests. If men enact some bad laws and select some bad men for office; if they fail to pass some good laws and elect some good men to remain in private life, they are all women's sons and pupils. If women were to vote they would be only the daughters and pupils of these same women.

Instead of fighting for the right to participate in the business of government, where they are not wanted any more than in the business of banking and railroading, and where women do not want to go, it would seem wiser to employ her energies in the training of men for statesmanship, and of women for the highest service—the moral, mental and spiritual energy that alone moves the machinery of government.

Man's part in forming habits and attitudes of mind in the child is at best and necessarily fragmentary, hence it must always be woman's supreme and exclusive job.

This natural gift of women is often employed as an argument in favor of municipal and school suffrage—municipal housekeeping as they choose to call it. To this there are several answers. Municipal housekeeping is fast being put into the hands of expert officials trained in all that makes for health and uplift in a community. That women in general are not qualified for this duty is attested by the fact that seventy-five per cent. of all food contamination takes place in the home, according to the late lamented Professor Ellen Richards.

In the interests of education for her children, she has won school suffrage in many places, where general suffrage is denied. That even this small amount of suffrage is not wanted by women is again shown by the fact that so few—less than two per cent., vote for school committee or seek office on the school board.

This is very fortunate both for the school and for the teacher, judging from my own experience.

Thirty odd years ago I had charge of the grade and high schools in a city of my native State of Iowa.

Having just finished a course in the same co-ed college, and at a part of the same time, as my dear friend Carrie Lane Chapman Catt, I was interested in, and inclined to Woman Suffrage. Being trained in scientific observation I naturally noted characteristic resemblances and differences in people and happenings.

Very early in my career as superintendent, I became interested in which one of the parents should come to interview me after the suspension of son or daughter. I soon learned to rejoice when I saw the father approach. He came for a serious consultation, to learn just what were his child's failings and how we might combine our efforts to strengthen and to help him. A mutually agreeable and helpful occasion.

But when my vision took in the mother, coming with determined stride up the broad walk, I at once decided to confine my remarks to a pleasant "Good Morning" when she entered and another when she departed. She did not come there for consultation or discussion. She was there for the express purpose of telling me what she thought of the school management in general and of her child's teacher in particular. Incidentally, also, she imparted conclusive information on the subject of her child's good qualities and that of the failings of the other children, and all with a finality that forbade discussion.

I could not understand why I rather admired than resented her performance. I have since discovered that it was because I was face to face with something elemental and supreme. I half recognized the most wonderful and powerful emotion that can move and control a living being—mother love. I was awed by the immensity of it. Instant, unreasoning, unfearing, defense of her child. And this is splendid. What if mother stood by us only when we are in the right! She would be no more to us than a father! What salvation in the consciousness that one can never sink so low nor be so depraved that mother will refuse to excuse, to comfort and to help!

Now, while this trait is essential and most beautiful in a mother, it is none the less a sorry credential to sit in the courts and councils of a nation.

True, it will be objected that not all women are mothers, therefore the exceptions can be impersonal and judicial. The

oldest kind of an old maid and the newest kind of a "new woman" are only one generation from an age-long line of mothers. Atrophy through disuse requires centuries in which to operate. This characteristic is manifest in the promotion of every cause and interest woman adopts. It becomes her very own in an intensely personal sense, and admits of no discussion. When she adopts suffrage, it becomes an object to promote and defend, with any and all weapons at her command. Bearing in mind the record of constituted authority defied, property destroyed, and even sacred treasures blown up by militant suffragists, together with the utterances of their apologists in this country, voters are justified in waiting for further evidence of the steady, refining effect on legislation by the entrance of women into politics.

One is reminded rather of the plight of a big dog who has for companion a little dog. When they chance to meet other dogs, no matter how many nor how big, the little dog invariably "starts something" and then flies to safety under the big dog, or behind a wall.

History records the fact that women, unable to fight, have in all national affronts been the first in rebellion and the last in reconstruction. War is always declared by rulers, regardless of the votes of individual men, and there is no indication that it would be referred to popular election if women had the ballot. The axiom that war will cease when women vote tallies not with history, nor woman nature.

All laws rest on force. Without the strong arm back of it, a law is the plaything of the unruly. Women never win a fight. When the majority of men oppose a law which is passed by any other demand than that of public opinion, it is a dead letter. For only men can enforce a law—use force in compelling obedience to law.

A better way has been found and tried, with practical and conclusive results. Through modern education, study clubs and civic societies, women have acquired accurate knowledge on many questions of public interest and practical betterment. Such knowledge is always sought and utilized in hearings before legislative committees.

Being outside of partisan politics, woman makes the appeal equally strong to men of all parties, whereas if she had the ballot, she would, being a Republican, Democrat or Progressive, appeal to the men on her own side of the house only. This is no vague speculation, but a matter of open record. Here in New Hampshire, where only men are partisans, women have not only been asked to appear before committees, but they have framed some of our most advanced betterment laws. They have been, by legislative committees, summoned to give the results of their study of scientific discovery as well as the reports of careful investigation into real conditions. After weighing these facts and results, presented in part by women, the legislators deliberately passed such laws as, the establishment of a State Board of Charities and Corrections, the removal of children from the almshouses, providing a home for the feeble-minded, creation of the State Conference of Charities and Correction, the gradual removal of the indigent insane from the almshouses to the State Hospital, amendment of the law discharging feeble-minded girls at the age of twenty-one so that they may be kept till after the child-bearing age, legislating that any feeble-minded woman may be committed to the State School after a proper hearing and on the certificate of two physicians, granting to mothers equal guardianship over their children, a mother's pension law, forestry laws and means for enforcing them, raising the age of consent from twelve to sixteen years, and the establishment of a Children's Commission to examine every phase of child welfare.

Women being welcomed to the legislative hearings on any measure pending, and invited to give any helpful information in their possession, are always, therefore, treated with respect. They have never noted a lack of chivalry, such as the suffragists complained of in a Congressional Committee hearing, when some of their statements were flatly contradicted by a member. Suffrage banners proclaim "Justice not Chivalry," but their innate womanhood feels the lack of it.

The tearful and fearful demand for democracy, for the rule of the people, turns a deaf ear to the voice of the nine-fold majority of women who do not want the ballot, as well as to the recorded majority of men at the polls. The Suffrage Amendment having been submitted by the New Hampshire Constitutional Convention to a vote of the electors, and defeated by a good majority in 1902, without organized opposition; again defeated in the Constitutional Convention in 1912; and again municipal suffrage, having failed in 1915, the plan of the suffragists now is to work for an act granting partial suffrage to women as was done in Illinois by a secret lobby of four women. Their hand was shown in a statement made by the State Treasurer at a grand rally, led by Mrs. Catt. Our level-headed legisla-

tors now understand the recent activity of the suffragists, their publicly avowed object being to thwart the will of the women of New Hampshire and the votes of the men by creating the conditions that obtain in Illinois.

The contention that because a few women want to vote it is wrong for those who do not to interfere or to do anything but refrain from voting, fails before the fact that the ballot imposes upon the patriotic citizen a duty as well as a privilege, and therefore the anti-suffragist woman will be obliged to look up candidates and measures proposed and vote when she thinks her suffrage neighbor will vote on the other side.

The rule of the people is ever the voice of the majority of legal voters, therefore since more than half a century of agitation has convinced only one woman in ten that she ought to have the ballot, since the suffrage movement is the only measure having for its object the extension of the ballot that has ever met with organized opposition from those it was proposed to enfranchise; and since the proposition to submit the question to a vote of the women is strenuously opposed by the suffragists, it would be decidedly undemocratic to inflict this burden on the many at the request of the few.

Suffrage has become a fight between women, and the results are most unhappy.

It would seem that, with so many and such vast unsolved problems yet before her, problems which no one but woman can solve, it were best that she still continue her study and good works, submitting her results and recommendations to the business judgment of man for examination, rejection or incorporation into laws, sane and efficient. Many of her most appalling problems are of her own making and must await her unmaking.

Prostitution and white slavery are not ballot problems, and have not diminished in suffrage States. Laws there are against them in plenty. Recent investigations of the Vice Commission show that prostitution is not due mainly to poverty and low wage, but largely is it due to ignorance, lack of home training and feeble-mindedness, as far as it can be due to anything outside of animal nature.

Sanitary experts will take care of infant mortality if women will take care of their homes and nurse their babies. The double standard of morals for men and women is another subject upon which the suffragists grow eloquent, raising a dust to obscure the glittering truth that woman alone creates and maintains this double standard. Woman is the sole arbiter of social caste and the one who slams the door of hope against the girl who stumbled in the dark, while swinging it wide to her partner in shame, provided only he be chivalrous and wealthy. Where and how she shall right this wrong is a more worthy concern than how she may force the ballot on an unwilling sex.

Akin to this and exclusively her own, is the servant problem. Woman, the sole maker and custodian of the home, has transformed what was once the pride and joy of womanhood, the care and nurture of the family, into a task to be shirked. Housework, including cleanliness, order, selection and preparation of food, the most vital concern of the race, she has labeled menial. We are compelled to look to the trained expert to restore the dignity of home-making, to raise housework to a science and clothe household management with the dignity of a profession. To be an assistant in this honorable calling can again become the ambition of the bright American girl, qualified to pass into a happy home of her own, who now, in order to escape the stigma of having been somebody's "cook," seeks the lower wage, the danger and discomfort of office and shop. When she marries it is to enact the tragedy of incompetence in a home of her own.

Domestic science schools, classes in home economics, sewing and cooking clubs for all classes of girls and women; the growing importance of household science in the curricula of all girls' colleges, as well as the increasing tendency to guide college girls into such post-graduate work as will be of use, not only in gainful occupation, but afterward in the vastly more important one of home-making, are all bright harbingers of the "good time coming," when woman will employ her matchless powers, not as imitation politician, policeman, soldier, lawyer, doctor—or any other "imitation man," but as supreme architect, with confident dignity laying the foundation plans upon which man must build under her direction the structure of a better civilization.

RIOT AND MURDER AT CHICAGO ELECTION

A MURDER crew took a hand in the 18th ward election today. One precinct worker was killed, a policeman attacked and beaten up and more than a score of shots fired by friends of the murderer, who tore him away from the officer and hurried him to a place of hiding. Two automobiles filled with "sluggers" stopped near a polling place at 1408 Van Buren Street this afternoon. According to reports sent to Chief Clerk Egan, seven or eight men jumped out of them and felled two men and a woman who were wearing Grogan badges. [Italics ours.]

"I have been told that slugging crews are going through the ward in forty automobiles," Mr. Egan said. "It is the most terrible election condition I ever heard of."—*The Chicago Daily News*, April 3d.

The killing occurred in front of a polling place at Lake and North Elizabeth Streets. Detective Sergeant James Carey was standing within six feet of William Basket, a negro election worker, when he says "Red" Applequist walked up to the negro and asked:

"What are you doing here?"

"Trying to earn a day's wages," was the reply.

"You'll never earn another day's wages," Carey says Applequist replied and fired three times. A bullet passed through Basket's heart. Carey seized Applequist and sent in a riot call. A block and a half away two autos dashed up beside Carey and his prisoner and a dozen men piled out, all of them setting upon the officer. He was knocked down, kicked and beaten. Applequist was loaded into the auto and they sped away.—*Chicago Examiner*, April 4th.

"Do you antis mean to imply that woman suffrage is responsible for that Chicago riot and murder?" the average suffragist will ask. We do not. We merely cite these facts to point out that Chicago election conditions, according to Chief Clerk Egan, are worse than ever, while Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, publicity chairman of the National American Woman Suffrage

Association, is deluging the papers of the East with this sort of nonsense:

"It must be borne in mind that in the cities where women vote there is no disorder at the polls, very little need for the police and, therefore, no additional police court expenses as the result of the election. The experience of every city will bear out this assertion. As a rule, in the equal suffrage States, there is scarcely a call for policemen on election day to quell any disorder at the polls. The papers of Chicago all say that election day is the most peaceful of the year." A letter containing this quotation, signed by Mrs. Harper, has recently appeared in numerous New York State papers. It is a fair sample of the contrast between suffrage testimony and the truth.

The women cast fewer votes in Chicago on April 3, 1917, than at any time since four suffragists went to Springfield and forced suffrage upon them, in 1913. Only 111,582, or 17.5 per cent. of the 638,090 Chicago women qualified to vote (excluding aliens) went to the polls. Of the 647,366 men eligible to vote, 297,931, or 46.5 per cent., voted. In other words, though there are only 101 eligible men to every 100 eligible women voters in Chicago, 267 men to every 100 women went to the polls at the last election.

Of course, no one can blame a woman for refraining from voting in a city where forty automobiles full of "sluggers" are killing men and felling women. But when a "gang" can scare the good women away while voting its own followers of both sexes, no sensible person can fail to see that woman suffrage helps the "gang."

In the vote by wards, it is noticeable that the men's vote was the deciding factor in every ward. Only in three wards, the ninth, twenty-fourth and thirty-third, did the majority of women vote for a different candidate than the majority of men. The men's vote, however, overcame the women's vote in these three wards. On all bond issues—there were five—the women voted similar to the men except in one instance. The women cast a majority of 3,151 against public comfort stations. The men carried this bond issue by a majority of 8,078, in spite of the women.

THE STATE CAMPAIGNS

AT the time of going to press, the situation is as follows:

Arkansas, petition for referendum being started to defeat the bill granting woman suffrage in primaries, which was passed by the Legislature, March 6.

North Dakota, anti-suffragists are circulating referendum petition on the statutory suffrage bill passed by the Legislature January 18.

Ohio, State Senator Harding declares that he expects little difficulty in obtaining 130,000 signatures to the referendum petition, which is nearly twice the necessary amount.

Referenda in these three States are dependent upon the success of the petitions being circulated for that purpose, which will prevent the statutory bills from going into effect, if the proposition is defeated at the polls next November.

New York will be a campaign State again this year, the Legislature on March 12 having referred the question to the voters, to be decided November 6.

Maine will be the first State to vote on suffrage in 1917. The election will take place on September 10. A big anti-suffrage victory in Maine in September will influence the other States, so all anti-suffragists should contribute as much as possible to the campaign in that State.

Michigan may be a campaign State in 1917, a bill for the referendum having passed the lower house.

The campaign States for 1917, therefore, are Arkansas, North Dakota, Ohio, New York, Maine—and possibly Michigan.

Iowa has passed a bill for the resubmission of suffrage to the voters in 1918. The bill was passed by the House, March 29, 85 to 20. It had passed the Senate previously. It must pass the next Legislature.

South Dakota will vote again on woman suffrage in 1918.

Oklahoma also, on March 17, passed a bill for submission in 1918.

Wisconsin has sent both suffrage bills, the one providing for a referendum to the women in 1918, and one providing for a referendum to the constitutional voters in 1918, to the Senate Committee on State Affairs, without recommendation. The suffragists are fighting the referendum to women as an anti-suffrage measure, and seeking the other bill in its place.

Minnesota defeated a Presidential suffrage bill, March 29, in the Senate, 35 to 31.

Nebraska, on March 28, defeated the bill for partial suffrage.

Rhode Island, according to press reports of April 12, passed a presidential suffrage bill in its Senate, 32 to 3.

Vermont, on March 23, passed a bill granting suffrage to women in town meetings for all officers except road commissioner. It was signed by the Governor March 20.

Bills providing for referenda to the women have been introduced in Wisconsin, Iowa and Nebraska this year. Suffragists are violently opposing them wherever submitted, alleging that the women have "no authority in this matter," and that it would be "expensive" to have a preliminary campaign to women only! Every anti-suffragist and reader of the *PROTEST* should send for a copy of the Wisconsin bill to submit suffrage to the women. The suffragists know that such a referendum would kill their cause and are fighting it under every imaginable pretext. No fair-minded person can read the Wisconsin bill without realizing that it is the fairest proposition ever made on this subject.

It is not too much to say that one big defeat of suffrage by the women of a great State will have more effect on public opinion than anything short of the repeal of suffrage in some of the suffrage States.

THE New York State Council will meet in Watertown April 19th, guests of the Jefferson County Anti-Suffrage League. Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, State president, will address the convention, consisting of two delegates from each auxiliary in the State.

"A Mile of Pennies, Nickels or Dimes." The New York headquarters have adopted this method of getting money for postage. Rolls of adhesive tape, "bowed" with the Anti colors, are sold to members for 10 cents. They are to be hung in a prominent place, in library or office, to attract the eye of guest or relative. On his inquiry, "What is this?" he is told that it is a "coin catcher," in case he has any superfluous pennies, nickels or dimes. "A mile of pennies" amounts to \$792; of nickels to \$3,960; and of dimes to \$7,920. We are indebted to Mrs. Nelson Henry for this original idea, which is already a huge success.

Recently an evangelist-suffragist from Pasadena, California, went to Johnstown and took up the hue and cry about the "liquor interests" being "in league" with anti-suffragists. The very alert Johnstown Committee got on his trail, with vigorous protests. The result is that the gentleman has apologized publicly from the pulpit. We

are told, "The church has refused to recommend him, and altogether we feel that he helped our cause rather than hurt it."

MRS. GOELET GALLATIN, Chairman of the Census Committee of the National League for Woman's Service, has issued the following call to the women of New York State:

"At the request of the Military Census Bureau of the Adjutant General's Office at Albany, the National League for Woman's Service calls upon all patriotic women in the State to volunteer their services for fifteen days in May, 1917. Women will be required to do unskilled as well as skilled office work in all election districts throughout the State. Both full-time and part-time volunteers are wanted for either day or night work.

"This is your first chance to show your patriotism. Register now at the National League for Woman's Service, 38 West Thirty-ninth Street."

THE New England Conference and Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association will be held April 26, in the Rose Room, Hotel Lennox, Boston. There will be two sessions: one at 11.00 A. M. for the Conference, one at 2.30 P. M. for the Annual Meeting. Between sessions, the Lennox will serve luncheon at \$1.00 a plate to delegates desiring it.

With women working for the American Red Cross, the National League for Woman's Service, the Navy League, the National Security League, the National Special Aid, the Surgical Dressing Committee, the Needlework Guilds, the Home Garden Associations, the Soldiers' Relief Committee, the Federations of Clubs, the Day Nurseries, the Congress of Mothers; with the average adult woman married and the mother of three children, and doing her own housework in over nine homes in every ten; with war calling upon women for new duties and more training, there are still some persons so ignorant of woman's real service to the State that they propose to "reward" women with the ballot—an additional burden.

The College Anti-Suffrage League has met with an enthusiastic response from college women. Many notable meetings have been held, and branches have been established even in such former suffrage strongholds as Bryn Mawr. A full list of the colleges now having anti-suffrage leagues and their officers may be obtained from Mrs. Thomas Allen, Organizing Chairman of the College Anti-Suffrage League.

NOTES AND COMMENT

THE suffrage pickets appeared again at the White House promptly at the opening of Congress on April 2. They also invaded the Capitol and the House and Senate Office Buildings. Apparently, they mean to keep on "pestering" the President and Congress as long as they can find half a dozen women in the United States willing thus to demonstrate their unfitness for the responsibilities of adults and their lack of political sagacity.

"Many a man is his own worst enemy," says an old saw. And some of the suffragists are committing political suicide. A prominent politician in Washington told the editor of the *PROTEST* a few days ago he thought the suffrage sentinels and the woman Congressman could not do more to defeat their "cause" if they were actually on the anti-suffrage payroll. They could not do as much. No anti-suffragist could design "stunts" showing the danger and futility of women in politics half so effective as those some suffragists seem to perform by instinct.

The attempt of the woman's party to have the Colorado Legislature go on record in favor of the Susan B. Anthony amendment failed on March 21st by a vote of 40 to 22. After twenty-three years' experience of the evils of woman suffrage, these legislators do not wish to see it forced upon other States.

THE suffrage system of attacking the antis because some liquor dealers oppose votes for women, sometimes slips a cog. In Connecticut, for instance, after a most violent campaign, led by Mrs. Katherine H. Hepburn, president of the Connecticut Woman Suffrage Association, during which all the old distortions and half-truths were juggled and presented as "proofs" of anti-suffrage alliance with the "wets," the *Hartford Times* says:

"As for the implied denunciation of the anti-suffragists as allies of the demon rum, that is creditable neither to the spirit nor the good sense of the suffragists. It was voiced by Mrs. Hepburn. . . . In so far as it asks us to recognize Mrs. Markham and her associates as conspirators on behalf of the liquor traffic it is so ridiculous as to be injurious to its proponents through the derision it inspires."

Suffrage accusations along these lines are growing more ridiculous all the time. Now we have it, upon the authority of no less distinguished a feminist than Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, that the "drys" and "wets" are "allies!"

Speaking at a suffrage mass-meeting in New York on March 27th, Mrs. Catt declared:

"The 'wets' oppose us because they think suffrage will bring prohibition, and some of the 'drys' stand with the 'wets' and they both fight suffrage together."

This statement was roundly applauded. "It is the truth," many suffragists asserted. Every suffrage speaker, now, with the usual allowance of exaggeration, can say:

"We have on file in New York a speech by our National president, which absolutely proves that all members of the W. C. T. U. and the Anti-Saloon League are working with the liquor interests to defeat suffrage!"

Meanwhile, the Fifth Campaign District of the New York State Woman Suffrage Party, in a special suffrage edition of the *Syracuse Post-Standard*, on March 17th, published a feature article, headed,

WOMEN VOTERS WOULD NOT PUT COUNTRY "DRY"

Suffragists Claim Giving Them
Ballot Will Not Mean Greater
Prohibition Soon.

OTHER THINGS ARE AT WORK.

Statistics Show That Equal Franchise
Has Not Had the Effect That
Many Have Expected.

The article concluded:

REALLY MAN'S PROBLEM

"The whole question is foremostly a men's problem. If the liquor interests will support instead of oppose legislation pointing toward reasonable restriction of liquor traffic they may pull along quite comfortably for some years. But persistent widespread intemperance among industrial forces spells death to liquor, even should no more women be enfranchised and should those who have already got the vote have it taken away from them.

Some great national crisis might clamp total abstinence down on the United States as it has on Russia. But history shows that enfranchising women has not proven the crisis that can be calculated to plunge States of the Union into bone dry prohibition."

Pacifist, socialist, feminist, suffragist are all parts of the same movement—a movement which weakens government, corrupts society and threatens the very existence of our great experiment in democracy.

It is to be regretted that the Russian revolutionists should weaken their cause by allying it with woman suffrage. The French revolutionists made the same mistake—woman suffrage was then tried in France—but it failed, as it had failed in Greece, as it had failed in Rome, as it later failed in New Jersey, and as it is now failing in the Western States. It will fail in Russia, and may prove the undoing of the young democracy to which all the free peoples of the world wish strength and success.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, OF THE WOMAN'S PROTEST, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for April 1, 1917.

STATE OF NEW YORK

COUNTY OF NEW YORK } ss.

Before me, a notary in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says she is the editor of THE WOMAN'S PROTEST, and that the following is, to the best of her knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443. Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher: The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Editor: Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Managing Editor: Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Business Manager: Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

2. That the owners are:

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, President, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Mrs. Wm. B. Glover, Secretary, Fairfield, Conn.

Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Treasurer, Glen Ridge, New Jersey.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are:

None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

MRS. ARTHUR M. DODGE, Editor.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this twenty-seventh day of March, 1917.

CHARLES EDGAR,

Notary Public No. 1384, Queens County,

[SEAL] Certificate filed in New York County, No. 37 Register's Office, No. 7053.

My commission expires March 30, 1917.

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 280 Madison Avenue, New York City.

Complete set, 50 cts. Single copies, 5 cts.
Selected packages, 25 cts.

PAMPHLETS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Taxation and Suffrage *Frederick Dwight*
First Legislative Address *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law
Dodgers
Suffrage a Cult of Self and Sex *Dr. Charles L. Dana*
Some Catholic Views
Red Behind the Yellow
Suffrage Not a Right *Hon. Henry L. Stimson*
Woman Will Not Gain by Suffrage *Judge Edgar M. Cullen*
An Argument Against the Woman Suffrage Amendment
Stephen H. Olin

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Case Against Votes for Women *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Case Against the Federal Amendment *Judge Oscar Leser*
A Destruction of the Right of Self-Government *Hon. Elihu Root*
A Message from His Eminence, James, Cardinal Gibbons
Woman Suffrage and Prohibition *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Militant and the Child *Mrs. F. M. Scott*
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc. *John R. Dos Passos*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation *Minnie Bronson*
Wage-Earning Woman and the State *Minnie Bronson*
Should Women Vote? *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*
Xantippe on Woman Suffrage *Reprint from Yale Review*
Dodgers—Statistics
Silk Pins.....10c. each Ribbon.....10c. and 15c. a yard
Celluloid Buttons.....5c. Pennants.....15c. and 25c.
New Poster Stamps.....35c. a hundred
Cartoon—Population Votes.....50c.
New Song—The Anti-Suffrage Rose.....10c.

MAN-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

52 Broadway Room 926 New York City

PUBLICATIONS

The Woman and the Vote. Address Carnegie Hall, January 26, 1914 *Everett P. Wheeler*
Feminist Revolutionary Principle Biologically Unsound *Prof. William T. Sedgwick*
Brief Submitted to House of Representatives, July, 1914 *Everett P. Wheeler*
Colorado and Suffrage *John C. Ten Eyck*

Consent of the Governed *Prof. Munroe Smith*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Brief on Woman Suffrage; Political Suffrage for Women Subversive of American Ideals
The Laws of New York Favor and Protect Woman
Raymond B. Seymour, of the New York Bar
What Women Have Done Without the Ballot
Everett P. Wheeler
(Republished by Permission from *The Reply*.)
Price 5 cents each—25 for \$1.00

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

Feminism (\$1.50) *Mr. and Mrs. John Martin*
The Eden Sphinx (\$1.25) *Mrs. Annie Riley Hale*
Anti-Suffrage Essays—by Massachusetts Women
Woman Adrift (\$1.50) *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman (\$1.25) *J. Lionel Taylor*
Vocation of Woman (\$1.50) *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*
The Business of Being a Woman (\$1.50) *Ida M. Tarbell*
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage (\$1.00) *Sir Almroth Wright*
The Ladies' Battle (\$1.00) *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power (\$1.25)
The Unrest of Women (\$1.00) *E. S. Martin*
Votes for Men (50c.)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) *Mrs. Rosziter Johnson*
These can be obtained by applying to
THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

The Remonstrance.....Subscription, 25c.
687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts.
The Case Against Woman Suffrage. A Manual.
Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage *Francis Parkman*
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage
Mrs. A. J. George
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I am Opposed to Woman Suffrage *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? *Frank Foxcroft*
Taxpaying Suffrage *Charles R. Saunders*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage *Ida M. Tarbell*
Woman Suffrage in Practice—An Answer to George Creel.
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage *Mrs. George A. Castwell*
Anti-Suffrage Manual (15c. a copy) *Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee*
An Anti-Suffrage Creed *Adapted from Octavia Hill*
A Social Worker's View of Suffrage *Mrs. Wm. Lowell Putnam*
Suffrage Statements Answered
Twelve Anti-Suffrage Reasons *Caroline M. Parker*
Why a Man Should Oppose Woman Suffrage *Frank Foxcroft*
Woman Suffrage Must Fail *Mrs. A. J. George (Independent)*
Woman Suffrage a Menace to Social Reform *Margaret C. Robinson*

Woman Suffrage a Failure in California

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association,
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615

687 Boylston Street

BOSTON, MASS.

Selected Packages, 25c.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find \$..... for.....years' subscription

Name.....

Street.....

City.....State.....

Subscription Rate, \$1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name.....

Street.....

City.....

State.....